Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4

EDDIE DUNBAR, Plaintiff,

v.

A. DAHLBERG, et al.,

Defendants.

Case Nos. 23-cv-00905-AMO (PR)

ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO STAY MERITS-BASED DISCOVERY: AND DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO FILE ONE MOTION FOR SUMMARY **JUDGMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 32

EDDIE DUNBAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

G. DARRETT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-00906-AMO (PR)

ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO STAY MERITS-BASED DISCOVERY; AND DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO FILE ONE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Re: Dkt. No. 29

Before the Court in the above-captioned actions are Defendants' administrative motions to stay merits-based discovery pending resolution of a summary-judgment motion based on *Heck v*. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), and if the Court denies the motion, for an extension of time to file a second, merits-based summary-judgment motion sixty-days from the date the Court issues its order denying the *Heck* motion.

Prior to the instant motions, Defendants requested in each action "that the Court modify its scheduling order and set a new briefing schedule that accommodates Defendants' need to investigate facts and prepare a summary-judgment or other dispositive motion." Dkt. 30 at 2 in Case No. 23-cv-00905-AMO (PR); Dkt. 27 at 2 in Case No. 23-cv-00906-AMO (PR). The Court

granted Defendants' requests to set a new briefing schedule in both actions, and the motions for
summary judgment are due on June 25, 2024. See Dkt. 31 in Case No. 23-cv-00905-AMO (PR)
Dkt. 28 in Case No. 23-cv-00906-AMO (PR).

Defendants' administrative motions to stay merits-based discovery and file more than one motion for summary judgment are **DENIED**. *See* Standing Order for Civil Cases, Section E.1. Moreover, the Court has already granted Defendants a previous extension of time to file their motions for summary judgment.

Accordingly, Defendants shall file <u>one</u> motion for summary judgment in each case no later than **June 25, 2024**. The plaintiff's opposition must be submitted in each case no later than **twenty-eight (28) days** after the date on which Defendants' motion is filed. Defendants shall file a reply brief in each case no later than **fourteen (14) days** after the plaintiff's opposition is filed.

This Order terminates Docket No. 32 in Case No. 23-cv-00905-AMO (PR) and Docket No. 29 in Case No. 23-cv-00906-AMO (PR).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 21, 2024

ARACELI MARTÍNEZ-OLGUÍN United States District Judge